

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 8-11 and 13 have been allowed. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pekarich et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,998).

Please amend the Specification at the paragraph beginning on page 7 and continuing onto page 8 as shown above. The amendment changes "two-dimensional matrix size K" to "input data size S". No new matter has been added.

Please add new Claims 14-17 as shown above. As new Claims 14-17 are similar to allowed Claims 8-11, based on the reasons for allowing Claims 8-11, Claims 14-17 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 12 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended (in addition to that which is discussed below) to recite that the first index is associated with a location in the memory; and, a determination is made if the first index is less than or equal to the reference parameter. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to reflect these amendments to Claim 1. No new matter has been added. Claim 12 has been amended to delete the step of generating a second control signal. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested that the amendments to Claims 1, 5, 6 and 12 be entered.

Regarding independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 2, the Examiner states that Pekarich et al. teaches generating a second index if said reference parameter is greater than said first index as recited in Claim 2, and cited Pekarich et al., col. 4, line 62 to col. 5., line 4. This section clearly states, "If the value...is less than or equal to threshold value..., select signal sel is set to enable buffer 311 and disable buffer 312. If the value...is greater than the threshold value...select signal sel is set to disable buffer 311 and enable buffer 312." Therefore, only a select signal is generated, not two separate indexes. Generation of a second index is neither taught nor disclosed by Pekarich et al. Claim 2 recites "means for generating a second index if said first index is greater than said reference parameter." This element is neither taught nor disclosed by Pekarich et al. Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of Claim 2; Claim 2 has been cancelled. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent Claim 12, as stated above that Pekarich et al. does not teach or disclose the generation of a second index, and as such, based on at least the arguments set forth

above with respect to Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 12 must be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-17, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter G. Dilworth

Reg. No. 26,450

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516